DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 776 SO 008 065

AUTHOR Neff, Kenneth L., Ed.
TITLE Non-Formal Education: New Strategies for Developing an Old Resource. Report on a Conference and Workshop. Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for International Studies in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Education; Conference Reports; *Developing Nations; *Educational Development; Educational Needs; *Educational Policy; Educational Problems; Educational Programs; *Nonformal Education

ABSTRACT

An international conference and a workshop on nonformal education were held on the campus of Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan, on April 24-May 3, 1974. The objective was to explore new strategies for developing nonformal education in order to more effectively meet the educational needs of developing nations. This is a report of that conference and workshop. The report is organized around three main topics: (1) The Need for New Educational Responses to a Changing Development Environment; (2) The Formulation of New Strategies for Non-Formal Education; and (3) An Action Agenda of Proposed Next Steps. The appendixes include a copy of the conference program, the names of the participants and their institutional affiliations, and a brief statement about the Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education at Michigan State University. (Author/RM)

ED100776

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NON-FORMAL EDUCATION
NEW STRATEGIES
FOR DEVELOPING AN OLD RESOURCE

Report on a Conference and Workshop

Kenneth L. Neff
Editor

Conference Coordinator: Cole S. Brembeck
Workshop Coordinator: Ted Ward

Program of Studies in Non-formal Education
Institute for International Studies
College of Education
Michigan State University
1974

SP 008 065

The Kellogg Center for Continuing Education
East Lansing, Michigan U.S.A.

Under the joint sponsorship of
Michigan State University: The Institute for
International Studies in Education

and

The Agency for International Development

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Need for New Educational Responses to a Changing Development Environment	4
III.	The Formulation of New Strategies for Non-formal Education	9
IV.	An Action Agenda of Proposed Next Steps	21
V.	Appendices	
	A. The Conference Program	A-1
	B. The Participants	B-1
	C. The Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education at Michigan State University	C-1

00004

Introduction

An international conference and a workshop on non-formal education were convened on the campus of Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan, on April 24-May 3, 1974. Both the conference and the workshop which followed it were sponsored jointly by the Agency for International Development and the University. The overall objective was to explore new strategies for developing non-formal education (NFE) in order to enable it to meet more effectively the needs of developing nations. It was felt that this objective could be achieved both by facilitating the flow of information and knowledge and by expanding the network of relationships among those who work on this exciting frontier of education.

This is a report of that conference and workshop. In preparing it we intentially avoided the "proceedings" approach of publishing papers prepared in advance. Instead, we have attempted to describe what occurred when practitioners and theoreticians from twenty-one nations, twenty-two universities, and twenty-six national and international agencies came together to formulate new strategies for applying NFE resources to development problems. Briefly, this is what happened: a number of NFE programs were described by persons who are actively involved in them, research on NFE was reported, a number of problems related to the development of NFE programs were sharply defined and examined, theories and propositions of NFE about the solutions of problems were asserted and debated, and the implications of all of these for future education policy were discussed. This brief report attempts to spin the fiber of these discussions into thematic threads and, further, to weave these threads into a fabric of meaningful outcomes. It is organized around three main topics: 1) the need for new educational responses to a changing development environment; 2) the formulation of new strategies for non-formal education, and 3) an action agenda of proposed next steps.

As appendices to this report we include a copy of the conference program, the names of the participants and their institutional affiliations, and a brief statement about the Program of Studies in Non-formal Education at Michigan State University.

A word about the organization of the conference and workshop may be in order. The conference program was designed to serve primarily an expository function, while the workshop provided opportunities for selected participants to react to the expositions and, interacting with one another, to produce outcomes worth taking home and sharing with their colleagues.

00005

Three plenary sessions of the conference were devoted to reports of on-going programs in various countries and to general descriptions of the environments within which NFE programs must function. In addition, seven critical problem areas, which were identified during the course of the three-year Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education at Michigan State University, were dealt with in two groups of concurrent conference sessions. The Economic Value of NFE," "Literacy and NFE," "Strategies for Developing NFE," "Making Learning Effective in NFE," "New Directions in NFE," "Educational Technology," and "Current Studies in NFE." The final session of the conference was devoted to summary and concluding remarks by selected participants.

The workshop was designed for participants representing the developing countries who wished to pursue significant issues and problems in greater depth. The number of participants was limited in order to make possible a meaningful exchange of ideas and experiences in a small-group environment. The "working" nature of the workshop was emphasized. Early correspondence with nominated participants suggested that they might profitably bring to the workshop a well-defined problem, or set of problems, upon which they would like to concentrate. Every effort was made to insure that there was maximum opportunity for participants to work non-formally on problems of importance to them and their colleagues. It was hoped that each participant would take home a "product" which would be useful in his or her work.

Resource people for the workshop consisted, most importantly, of the participants themselves, many of whom had rich and extensive experience in NFE, plus invited outside guests selected from lists provided by the coordinator of the workshop.

Another feature of the conference and workshop was the NFE Information Center. The growing interest in NFE has generated a wealth of new materials, publications, and other resources; much of this material, contributed by and collected from numerous sources, was on display in the center both for browsing and distribution. In addition to the large number of materials distributed during the conference, more than 2,000 items were mailed to participants after the close of the workshop.

As a result of this favorable response, the NFE Information Center has been made a permanent part of Michigan State University's Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education.

The Need for New Educational Responses to a Changing Development Environment

The title of the conference and workshop was "Non-formal Education: New Strategies for Developing an Old Resource." Viewed in a national development context, the theme provided the central focus for the discussions. Substantial progress was made in exploring both our current knowledge and our continuing experience in non-formal education, in an effort to formulate components of strategies for utilizing NFE to promote national development. The term "new strategies" might imply to some that there were already in existence "old strategies" in need of change. This is indeed the case, but the strategies in need of change are those national development strategies which have made little or no use of NFE. The objective of these meetings was to explore new development strategies which would make greater and more specific use of NFE as one of the educational tools of development.

If "old" development strategies are in need of change, one is prompted immediately to ask, "why?" Have our concepts of development needs changed? The deliberations of the conference and workshop would support an affirmative answer. Changes and shifts in development concepts and policies comprised a constant theme in virtually every session and many of the recommendations in the workshop reports were based on the assumption that such changes are taking place. Another recurring theme was the reference to earlier strategies that didn't work, particularly in their efforts to develop and utilize formal education exclusively as a development tool and catalyst.

The second plenary session of the conference dealt directly with the question of changing development needs and education policy in the course of describing current national development environments within which NFE must function. Both speakers, Frederick Harbison and Richard Niehoff, expressed their dissatisfaction with past national development theory, policy, and practice. They noted that national manpower development programs too often benefited only the few in the modern sector at the expense of the many in the traditional agricultural sector. The gap between the rich and the poor has grown steadily wider, and the quality of life for most of the world's poor is little better today than it was ten or twenty years ago.

This disparity is particularly noticeable in terms of the distribution of educational benefits. In spite of massive expenditures for expanding and operating formal school

systems in the developing countries, there are now more school-age children out of school than there were one or two decades ago. There are also more people who can neither read nor write than there were twenty years ago. There have been **percentage** increases both in literacy and school attendance, but the world's high rate of population has wiped out these modest percentage gains.

This discouraging picture has led to an increasing realization among government leaders in the developing countries, and among donor agencies, that continued exclusive reliance upon formal education systems is both economically and educationally not feasible. If only token advances are possible, even when up to one-fifth of a nation's budget is devoted to formal education, providing schooling opportunities for every member of society is simply out of reach. Awareness of this fact has served to arouse interest in the potential role that NFE might play in national development programs. The expectation, although unproven, is that NFE programs can produce comparable benefits at less cost.

There is more to the current shift of attention to NFE, however, than mere dissatisfaction and economic frustration with formal education systems. The speakers noted trends in national development policy formulation that are moving away from earlier capital-intensive, high-rate-of-saving, deferred-consumption, maximize-the-GNP approaches. One now can find numerous policy statements that speak of improving the quality of life, and of achieving a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development. Harbison suggested that we endeavour to achieve our increases in GNP by increasing the income (and output) of the masses of people in all sectors of the economy, rather than striving for massive increases in the modern sector. The overall percentage increase in GNP may be the same, but the all-sector approach will produce a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development.

The above objectives imply increased, but more equitable, consumption. They also reflect a concern for greater short-term payoffs on development efforts. The implementation of such policies will involve dealing more effectively with the problems of daily life, rather than bequeathing most or all of the benefits of development to a future generation whose life may or may not be improved as a result.

Thus, the development environment of the mid-1970's is markedly different from that of a decade ago. The physical reality of a worldwide food shortage has served to intensify our concern

90008

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that the world's most serious problems of underutilization of resources exist in the rural sectors of the developing countries. And, philosophically, development policies are showing greater concern for a more equitable distribution of the benefits of modernization and development.

Given this **new** interpretation of development needs and **revised** policy frameworks for attaining **altered** objectives, an important next step becomes that of mobilizing and utilizing resources appropriate for implementing new programs. In the education sector this means all educational resources - formal, non-formal and informal. This need to view educational development planning problems as dealing with a "total national learning system" was stressed throughout the conference and workshop.

Formal educational systems, as they have developed in most of the nations of the modern world, have not been noted for dealing with problems of the learner's daily existence, except as those problems might be associated with his or her role as "student." In a sense, formal educational systems are somewhat like the earlier approaches to national development - they require an investment of time and effort in the present with an expectation of benefits in some indefinite future. In addition, formal systems are highly individualistic and competitive, utilizing fallible methods to compare individual performance to abstract norms and/or to peer performance. Elite selection is very effectively performed by such systems.

Non-formal education, on the other hand, is far more concerned with the here and the now - with the problems and needs of daily life. In fact, its chances of success seem to be reduced if rewards and benefits are too long deferred and not easily traceable to active participation in a learning experience. Group learning and cooperative problem solving are encouraged and invidious peer comparisons are usually avoided.

As we indicated earlier, national development policies are shifting and recognizing new development needs which include, even stress, the improvement of the quality of life. Our theories of national development have long recognized the key role played by education in the development process. The formulation of new strategies appropriate to new objectives requires the selection of those educational tools best suited for producing the desired outcomes. It is not a question of abandoning the formal system and replacing it with a non-formal structure - it is a matter of allocating resources within the national learning system to development tasks on the basis of each resource's capability to

00009

produce desired outcomes. Non-formal education seems to be ideally suited for attacking problems most directly associated with daily existence. Other, longer term, development roles continue to be played most suitably by the formal educational system. We need to use both of these educational resources if we are to develop truly effective nationwide learning systems.

In the process of pointing up these current shifts in development theory and policy, both speakers painted a stark picture of the environment in which non-formal education must function. The traditional rural agricultural sector was singled out as being the most in need of development – it is in this sector that most of the poor, the illiterate, the untrained and undertrained, the undernourished, and the overly prolific exist. Development objectives in this sector have, in the past, been determined more by idealism than realism. National political leaders in most countries typically have few rural "roots" and are not aware of the felt needs of the people. These leaders have tended to formulate policies and establish objectives largely on the basis of what they feel rural people "ought to need," rather than on what rural people themselves feel they need.

The opinion was expressed that this situation is due in large part to the political underdevelopment of the rural sector – too few national politicians have a feeling of commitment to that sector, and, electorally, these areas all too frequently have little political "clout" in national politics. Consequently, the people and problems of the traditional rural sector are not a conscious part of the thinking of national policy makers. In addition, the shortage of qualified, dedicated political leadership at local levels makes working-level coordination and administration of development programs extremely difficult.

This overview of the development environment brought to light new perspectives that emerged again and again in various contexts in the course of the conference and workshop. What needs to be stressed in terms of this report is the fact that the increased attention that NFE is receiving on the world scene is not due solely to an attempt to explore for less expensive educational delivery systems. Costs most assuredly are a factor – so, too, are benefits. Development planners are faced with the task of matching resources to objectives. Given the shifts which are currently taking place in development objectives, the suitability of formal education as the sole resource for attaining some of them is now being questioned and the potential usefulness of NFE is being seriously explored.

Formulating New Strategies for Non-Formal Education

The conference and workshop dealt with problems of strategy formulation in four areas:

(1) Strategies for matching educational resources, both formal and non-formal, with development tasks within a framework of nationwide learning systems,

(2) Strategies for assessing and selecting non-formal alternatives which seem most appropriate for the development task at hand,

(3) Strategies for international and national interaction among groups and individuals related to non-formal programs, and

(4) Strategies for developing and refining NFE as a national development tool.

The first two areas are concerned with the **uses** of NFE. The second two are primarily concerned with **strengthening** NFE. We shall examine the four strategy problems under these two headings.

Utilizing Non-Formal Education

In discussing the utilization of NFE two broad topic areas emerged as being significant: 1) the need to match appropriate educational resources, both formal and non-formal, with developmental tasks and, 2) the need to select from among NFE alternatives those which seem best suited to do the job. The first area involves such matters as performance capability and cost benefits. The second area involves strategic questions within the area of NFE itself. We turn now to a discussion of these two areas related to concerns for using NFE in the most effective manner.

Matching educational resources with development tasks. What have we learned about the ability of NFE to assist strategists as they ponder which educational resource seems best suited to perform a given development task? This question came under discussion in a number of the sessions. Perhaps it can be best illustrated by a hypothetical educational planning problem.

Let us assume that it is proposed that some agent(s) perform one or more functions which will impact a target population in order to achieve a desired outcome within a specified period of time. Newly emerging development policy trends already discussed suggest that the target population is in the rural sector and the desired outcome is an improvement in the quality of life. The period of time suggested is for the immediate future – the

00011

short-run. Education and training are the functions to be performed. It is left to the strategist to determine the agent and, by implication, the method by which the function will be performed.

What are the key factors influencing the choice between a formal and non-formal approach? One of the first considerations should be the capability of the agent (and consequently the methods to be utilized) to achieve the desired outcome. In other words, the prime task facing the strategist will be to select the most appropriate means to reach the desired ends. Two factors that weigh most heavily in such a choice are cost and effectiveness. Ultimately, one tries to attain the greatest benefit for the least cost. Thus, there are two pivotal decision areas involved in making choices between formal and NFE approaches in meeting development needs: performance capability and cost per benefit.

Performance capability should be the first decision criterion applied. It would be a waste of time to perform decision rituals between two or more choices when only one of the alternative choices is capable of producing the desired outcome. One's first concern is, which alternative under consideration can best do the job? We have already discussed what is perhaps the most persuasive factor in favor of NFE: its capacity to respond and relate to its environment. NFE is more developmental in the pedagogical sense. Characteristically NFE ends (needs) tend to determine means, whereas in formal school systems means (educational rituals) often tend to become ends in themselves. When development needs seem to require "tailored" programs, therefore, NFE seems better suited to the task. Also, as stated earlier, NFE historically has demonstrated more competence in dealing with pressing problems of daily existence than have the schools.

Discussions of performance capability centered on (1) determining the nature of the needs and (2) assessing the probable learning effectiveness of a given mode of education when applied to a particular task.

The needs issue plagued the conference and workshop in a number of ways and must be reported as remaining among the "unresolved questions" still facing us. Both conference statements and the reports of the workshop urge that NFE respond to the needs of the learner. Most of the participants seem to be convinced that potential learners know best what their needs are. The workshop itself probably contributed to this conviction, since it was successfully conducted as a learner-directed activity.

000 12

There remained another dimension, however, that seemed to require some exogenous need determination: the dimension of community development. One example might serve to point up the areas of disagreement between approaches. National development and modernization frequently transform the character of communities and the fact that such a transformation is to take place is often known by external persons and agencies before members of the community itself are aware of it. For example, one target of a national development plan may be to establish an extensive steel mill complex in what is now a quiet fishing village on the coast. A number of the learning needs that such a community transformation is likely to generate can be anticipated by external agents before members of the community begin to sense them and express them as felt needs.

Some participants felt that NFE strategists and planners should not always wait until communities become aware of problems and ask for help, especially when one can predict that a problem is certain to arise and the learning needs that it will generate can be anticipated. On the other hand, much of our experience with NFE tells us that target populations are less likely to participate effectively in programs that address problems alien to their experience, or which train them to perform roles that they cannot easily associate with tangible personal or community benefit. Thus, we must seriously ask ourselves how effective NFE is likely to be in dealing with **anticipated** community development problems.

Another consideration in determining the performance capability of an educational tool is the effectiveness with which learning takes place.

How effective is learning in the non-formal mode as compared to learning that takes place in schooling environments? Some rather fundamental pedagogical issues are involved. Perhaps first and foremost is the combinational issue of who knows best what to teach, to whom, and how to teach it? Traditionalist pedagogues tend to question the value of learner-directed educational processes. It is perhaps overstating the case to say that they perceive themselves as almost omnipotent sources from whence such knowledge as they deem appropriate shall be "handed down" to the "deserving" according to conditions specified by the "schooled." Nevertheless, they almost always perceive "teaching" to be a process of "handing down" knowledge. This concept clearly structures the roles of "teacher" and "student." The directness of NFE, and the peer relationships between teacher and learner, present challenges with which most trained teachers have not been prepared to cope.

Both the workshop and the conference sessions on learning effectiveness practically demonstrated that 1) participant-directed learning can be effective and 2) participant-directed approaches present far greater challenges to the teacher than do classroom situations in formal schools where "teacher" and "student" roles are clearly defined and understood. Many teachers experience great difficulty when they cannot teach on their own terms. The prospect of students exerting any control over learning objectives is viewed by them as a problem of "losing control" of the class, not as an opportunity for creative learning to take place with the teacher playing a constructive role of "informed peer." This may be due to the fact that too few teachers have had practical experience related to the subject areas they teach. Formal school teachers are professional teachers. NFE teachers are better characterized as professionals who teach. Both have their strengths and limitations, and these should be recognized by the educational development strategist.

Is NFE sufficiently cost-effective to be a feasible alternative to formal school approaches? Strategic outcomes are often determined by the answer to this type of question. As strategist and planner assess available resources for meeting priority development goals, they search for resource applications that promise to produce the greatest benefit for the least cost. The questions requiring answers seem misleadingly simple: 1) what are the costs? 2) how are they measured? and 3) who pays them? Likewise: 1) who benefits? 2) how do they benefit? 3) what are the benefits? 4) what are the values of the benefits? and 5) how are they measured? Panel members pointed out that taking an "economic point of view" in the evaluation of NFE may overlook many important benefits which cannot be observed in the short run and for which it may not be possible to assign monetary values. Though NFE may not have immediate economic value, it can have short-run effects on the "quality of life," such as improved health and nutrition, increased confidence and self-reliance, and more productive social behavior. The economist does not usually look at such matters, but these may be the most important "values" of NFE. Thus, the comparative assessment of benefits presents many thorny problems.

So, too, does the comparison of costs, particularly in the rural development context. To date, most of the efforts by economists to compare costs of formal and NFE programs have dealt with technical and vocational type programs in the industrial sector. Alternatives studied have been formal courses of study at vocational schools on the one hand, and on-the-job training on the other. Results show that on-the-job training is more effective than

formal vocational training and, at the same time, more costly. However, these results can be highly misleading when considering alternative applications in rural communities.

Cost-benefit comparisons can be used to strive for optimal resource utilization as long as long as one can safely assume that the resources in question are mobile and can effectively be committed to alternative uses. Then the question of where and how best to use the resources is a real one.

In the rural areas of many developing countries substantial market activity takes place on a "barter" basis. Studies of NFE programs operating in rural areas often reveal heavy dependence upon voluntary contributions of time and resources. A housewife donates her time to teaching sewing to young girls in the village and donates the use of her sewing room as a learning environment. The time and facilities used as resources for this NFE activity have only limited alternative uses. It is highly doubtful that they are sufficiently mobile to be utilized in another geographic location, and any question of their being used by the local formal school would have to be resolved in consideration of curricular requirements and the eligibility of an "untrained" teacher to teach. By computing costs for these volunteer resources, cost-benefit analysis could show that these sewing lessons cost society more than would similar lessons at the girls' vocational school in the provincial town some miles away. But this would require the use of supplemental resources, not an alternative use for the same resources. Such uses of volunteer and donated resources enable communities to supplement educational resources available to society in ways which the communities can understand and afford. The alternative of the community contributing comparable convertible resources in the monied economy may not exist.

Cost-benefit comparisons can produce information helpful to the strategist, and they do encourage us to ask the "right" questions. The value of the findings of such studies is limited, however, when applied to traditional rural development environments. Comparative studies between NFE and formal programs in rural areas are difficult to conduct because their processes and outcomes are often not sufficiently comparable, and NFE's extensive use of volunteered time and "in kind" resources can make the questions of alternative uses for such resources something of a moot one.

Assessing and selecting non-formal alternatives. NFE sector strategy, i.e., consideration of alternative courses of action within the NFE sector, entered the conference proceedings more or less on an ad hoc basis. In the course of reviewing the results of case studies and as delegates from different countries and agencies discussed projects and programs, a few "do's and don'ts" were suggested to guide strategists.

Participants were urged not to engage too freely in projects to reform and redirect NFE until it can be demonstrated that we have adequate analytical tools to evaluate existing activities and determine what needs to be done. The danger of destroying local initiative and "formalizing" NFE through well-intentioned administrative action was discussed at several junctures and NFE strategists were cautioned to be careful not to respond more to the needs of institutions than to the needs of the people. It was also suggested that the success of a program is likely to be closely associated with the learner's perception of the relationship between participation and immediate benefit derived from such participation. The question of "rewards" for participation in the form of diplomas or certificates was raised on several occasions with opinions clearly divided. Though the value of certification in mobile labor markets was acknowledged, many persons felt that the use of "paper rewards" is a product of the "schooling" mentality that probably would not have the desired motivating effect in most NFE programs.

In addition to the obiter dicta principles exemplified by the above, there were two major NFE sector strategy questions discussed at length - the role of literacy and the need to develop sufficient infrastructure to permit responsible planning and administration without "formalizing" NFE. The latter topic deals mostly with the need for developing NFE as a tool, and it will be discussed later under that heading. The literacy question, however, deserves our attention now.

Is literacy an end, or a means to an end? This report already has underscored the attention that conferees chose to devote to the subject of literacy. To some literacy is an end; to others, it is but a means to an end. Whether means or end, there is little doubt that literacy has received at least as much international attention as any educational outcome since the end of World War II. This preoccupation with the ability to read and write as a "precondition" to learning, and to modernization that learning produces, has resulted in a number of "misdirected" programs where literacy statistics have become something of a prestigious indicator of a level of national development. This is both unfortunate and unproductive.

0C0:6

Our western "schooled" backgrounds prepare us to accept the assumption that literacy is a "precondition" to learning. Because the abstract content of schooling cannot be communicated solely by experience, learning via the written word is essential. However, our experience with NFE suggests that this is not a universal principle. Conference participants were introduced to illustrated materials that have been used successfully to teach without use of the written word. It was also suggested that early steps in development applications of NFE using direct (non-literacy based) methods would produce learning habits and make the illiterate aware of the value of learning. Once the target group began to perceive of literacy as a means to acquire further learning, literacy programs directed toward learners' needs could be effectively used.

Literacy discussions also devoted considerable time to methods and program elements, with particular stress on functional literacy approaches. General recommendations were that:

(1) Content should be related to the felt needs of the target group;

(3) Delivery systems which sustain gains made by the learners should be used; and

(3) There should be follow-up both in terms of literacy skills and content.

This last point is important, for many literacy programs have failed for the lack of follow-up reading materials. The functional approach to teaching literacy requires that content be related to the needs of daily life, including the acquisition of new skills. The value of becoming literate may be discredited just as effectively by the learner experiencing that **what** he learned was not relevant as it may be by the lack of follow-up reading materials. For example, content dealing with improved health care may be dismissed as irrelevant if the local clinic and health services are poorly equipped and do not follow the practices described in the literacy materials. Both literacy and health care programs may suffer as a result.

The conference proceedings left little doubt that literacy is now considered as a means, rather than an end. There was also an awareness that a major stumbling block in the struggle against illiteracy is the lack of motivation to become literate. It was pointed out that expatriate funding agencies show more interest in literacy programs than do the potential clients. Functional approaches to teaching literacy seem to have been somewhat

more successful than earlier efforts, but we continue to fall behind in our struggle to reduce the number of illiterate persons in the world.

Fortunately, literacy is not an absolute precondition for learning and progress can be made toward improving the quality of life without relying up on literacy. Once learning has taken place and its value has been demonstrated, there may result a marked increase in motivation to become literate. There is ample evidence that we can teach literacy to the motivated learner. Perhaps one important task for NFE is to generate this needed motivation.

As the reader may correctly gather, much of the discussion about strategy formulation for NFE centered on questions directed at the appropriate uses of this mode of education. It is important that we continue to inquire into how we can effectively use all educational resources and organize them into reinforcing, nationwide learning systems, taking into account their respective performance capabilities and cost/benefit ratios. It is also important to be able to choose from among NFE alternatives those best suited to accomplish the tasks at hand.

Another important factor in strategy formulation is that of developing and strengthening NFE, and we turn to that topic now.

Developing Non-Formal Education

A problem of great concern to the participants of this conference was the need for further development and refinement of NFE as a tool for providing critically needed educational services. Thus far, our report has presented a rather promising and positive picture of the development roles NFE is capable of performing. Now we must shift our attention to some very important provisos. This section of the report will attempt to summarize and analyze major problem areas that emerged from frequent problem-sharing discussions that occurred during the conference and workshop, particularly as they relate to two areas of strategy formulation: strategy for developing NFE and strategy for guiding international assistance efforts to support the development of NFE.

Four broad problems areas emerged from the conference and workshop sessions, each one somewhat multi-dimensional: 1) knowledge creation, 2) knowledge sharing, 3) structural development, and 4) training support. Of these four concerns, structural development was the most pervasive, touching on virtually all NFE development problems discussed. Consider some of its implications.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Structural needs for national NFE programs are both pressing and varied. Planning, particularly using the "systems approach," becomes exceedingly difficult without meaningful structure. One cannot plan to proceed from one state of a system to a desired state of the system by controlling inputs and outputs through institutional channels when: 1) such institutional channels either do not exist or are poorly defined and 2) neither the present nor the future state of NFE can be described functionally as a system. What is particularly troubling to NFE strategists is the knowledge that too much structuring and/or the use of inappropriate structures are likely to be self-defeating. Structure that interferes with the characteristic NFE process of adapting programs to felt needs can sap the motivation of potential learners and result in NFE losing the confidence of the communities it proposes to serve. Structure also can quash local initiative and "dry up" volunteered resources by imposing elaborate bureaucratic procedures. Indeed, excessive structure can succeed in "formalizing" NFE.

Obviously, these pitfalls must be avoided. At the same time, if NFE is to be an instrument for **national** development, if there are to be **national** programs to utilize NFE as an important provider of educational services, there must be sufficient structural substance at the national level to permit the channeling and administration of resources and planning and coordination of program elements. Because NFE activities tend to be so goal- and environment-specific, the need for coordinative structure extends down to the local level.

Potential donor agencies and sponsoring groups also feel uncomfortable in the absence of structural elements with which to interact. The Michigan State University study team report on international interaction strategy was discussed at one of the conference sessions. It proposed a strategy to guide "institutional interaction," an approach that is useful only is there are institutions present and capable of performing the roles described.

Similarly, the creation and sharing of knowledge and the training of personnel require institutions capable of commanding and administering resources, and designing and implementing programs.

The most promising alternative discussed at the conference for dealing with the problem of meeting structural needs without overwhelming the institution was the proposed use of networks – administrative networks, communications networks, training support networks. The Colombians shared valuable experiences with other delegates in the arena of network development; the

Information Center provided a working example of how a communications network might serve the interests of administrators, researchers, and evaluators alike, and numerous interchanges among the participants explored the merits of training support and coordinative networks.

Networks seem particularly suitable for providing needed structure in the NFE sector because they permit maximum operational latitude and at the same time provide sufficient institutional structuring for the implementation of national development policies, responsible administration, and accounting and the back-up of local priority programs with needed training and technological support. The use of networks should facilitate the implementation of flexible development policies that do not stifle local initiative with "cease and desist" regulations. Rather, policy guidelines should encourage developmentally productive programs. They should stimulate communities to use their own resources in order to undertake NFE projects which meet their felt needs, even though such programs might not fall sufficiently within national development priority areas to obtain national support.

National support networks would also serve the valuable international functions of relating to donor and sponsoring agencies and serve as links in international information collecting and sharing. The existence of such a network complex would better enable us systematically to evaluate NFE programs and to share knowledge gained with fellow professionals, both practitioners and theoreticians. Furthermore, such national networks should provide appropriate channels through which international training support programs could effectively support national development efforts.

Conference participants clearly had more to say about knowledge generation, knowledge sharing, and training support than the fact that we ought to have institutional structures to facilitate them. They agreed that our efforts sytematically to analyze our experiences and report our findings should not cease. They strongly urged that research findings be translated into training programs for the planners, strategists, operators, and coordinators of tomorrow's NFE development programs. Their message was clear: learn, share, train, and act.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proposed Next Steps: An Action Agenda

Non-formal education is a tried and proven resource. It is perhaps the oldest form of education known to man. Societies lacking a written language have had to rely upon NFE as virtually the sole means of cultural transmission from generation to generation. We know that at local levels it can produce effective learning at a cost that most communities can manage. We also know that it can assist communities and individuals to cope more effectively with the problems of daily existence.

We are less comforted by our knowledge that NFE has yet to demonstrate at the national level an effective, low cost, mass audience capacity. The fact that most projects tend to be small, isolated, and highly goal- and environment-specific, plus their often heavy dependence upon volunteered resources, boggles the minds of planners and systems analysts. The lack of communications linkages is but one of a host of problems frustrating administrative efforts. And in spite of a considerable outpouring of published information on NFE over the past few years, there remains a serious shortage of reported systematic evaluations of previous NFE experience.

Unresolved Questions

There were also major unresolved questions left dangling at the conference end:

1. The role of literacy in NFE programs remained vague in spite of continued discussion. Some of the participants could not fully accept the idea that meaningful learning outcomes can be achieved without depending upon literacy in the learning process.
2. The conference came out strongly favoring NFE programs based upon the felt needs of the target population, but doubt lingered about NFE's capability to maintain sufficient levels of learner motivation to deal successfully with exogenously determined community needs.
3. The pros and cons of using a documentary reward system for NFE were ably discussed, but no clear position emerged.

Guidelines to the Future

The conference and workshop participants did offer specific suggestions and guidelines for the tasks ahead. In essence, the participants:

1. Urged exploration and experimentation with network concepts to facilitate administration, coordination, and communication;

2. Identified a pressing need for programs to train professionals and para-professionals in NFE areas;
3. Strongly endorsed the principle that NFE programs be based on the felt needs of the people and proposed that systematic need assessment be an important early step in strategy formulation;
4. Recognized the need for continuing efforts to build and extend our knowledge base in NFE and stressed the vital role that one or more clearinghouse activities can perform to facilitate the sharing of knowledge;
5. Cautioned against pitting NFE against the formal system and encouraged integrative approaches stressing the complementarity of these two approaches to dealing with educational problems;
6. Stressed the need for innovation, adaptation, and creativity in the processes of strategy formulation and program design;
7. Warned against the danger of "bureaucratically overwhelming" NFE in our efforts to administer and coordinate it;
8. Encouraged exploration and experimentation with "new approaches," especially those that can produce desired learning outcomes without requiring literacy;
9. Called for more and better evaluation of NFE activities; and
10. Underlined the importance of sustaining a dialogue among the participants after their return home.

A curious assortment of threads emerged from the conference and workshop sessions. When woven into a fabric, they produce a multitude of distinct and substantial motif fragments that seem to be begging for the assistance of an accomplished development archaeologist to place them in meaningful proximity one to another. There is little doubt in this reporter's mind that the conference and workshop succeeded in focusing on key problem areas, produced a greater awareness of the nature of many of the important tasks remaining to be done, and enabled the participants to return home with a useful agenda to adapt to their own problems.

00022

The Program

Wednesday, April 24

8:00 a.m.–6:30 p.m. Registration Conference Desk, Lobby, Kellogg Center

1:00 p.m. Planning Luncheon for all persons on the program, Big Ten Room

2:30 Panel participant meetings, Rooms 108, 110, 210, Vista and Heritage

Conference Opening

5:30 Reception, Red Cedar Room

6:30 Dinner, Big Ten Room

Cole S. Brembeck, Director, Institute for International Studies in Education, Michigan State University, Presiding

NFE in Action: Firsthand Reports, Big Ten Room

Ralph H. Smuckler, Dean, International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University, Chairman

Emile Vargas Adams, The Ford Foundation, Colombia

Winarno Surakhmad, Deputy Director, Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology (INNOTECH), Saigon

Kowit Vorapipatana, Chief, Adult Education Division, General Education Department, Ministry of Education, Thailand

Thursday, April 25

8:30 a.m. **Plenary Session, Lincoln Room**

NFE and Nationwide Learning Systems

Keith Goldhammer, Dean, College of Education, Michigan State University, Chairman

Frederick Harbison, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University

Richard O. Niehoff, Center for International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University

Coffee, Red Cedar Room

10:30 a.m.	**Plenary Session, Lincoln Room** **NFE in the Development Process: Country Examples** **Harold Freeman**, Chief Education Officer, Bureau for Asia, Office of Technical Support, Agency for International Development, Chairman **Haile Yesus Abeje**, Assistant Minister of Elementary and Non-Formal Education, Ministry of Education and Fine Arts, Ethiopia **Joaquim Alfredo Soares Vianna**, Director, Department of Suppletive Education, Ministry of Education and Culture, Brazil
12:15	**Luncheon, Centennial Room** **Ralph Smuckler**, Presiding **Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.**, President, Michigan State University: Comments **Joel Bernstein**, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Technical Assistance, Agency for International Development: Comments
2:00–4:30	**Concurrent Sessions** **Session 1: The Economic Value of NFE, Room 106** **Michael Borus**, School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, Chairman **Manzoor Ahmed**, Associate Director, Educational Strategy Studies, International Council for Educational Development **John Hilliard**, Center for Studies in Education and Development, Harvard Univeristy **John Hunter**, Department of Economics, and Director, Latin American Studies Center, Michigan State University **Manuel Zymelman**, Center for Studies in Education and Development, Harvard University

00024

Session 2: Literacy and NFE, Vista Room

William A. Herzog, Department of Communication, Michigan State University, Chairman

Hernando Bernal Alarcon, Planning Chief, Accion Cultural Popular (ACPO), Colombia

Michael Chiappetta, Chairman, Department of International and Comparative Education, Indiana University

Jack Mezirow, Department of Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Kowit Vorapipatana, Chief, Adult Education Division, General Education Department, Ministry of Education, Thailand

Session 3: Educational Technology: What We Know About Its Use in Nonformal Education, Heritage Room

Henry T. Ingle, Program Officer, Instructional Technology Projects, Academy for Educational Development, Chairman

Mario Dardon, Director, Programa de Ecucacion Basica Rural Ministerio de Edducacion, Guatemala

Emile McAnany, Institute for Communication Research, Department of Communication, Stanford University

Robert Morgan, Director, Center for Educational Technology, Florida State University

Howard Ray, Basic Village Education Project, USAID/Guatemala

Thomas Rich, Florida Mental Health Institute, Tampa

7:30-9:00 p.m. **A Festival of Films on NFE,** Rooms 106, 110, and Vista

Discussion Leaders:

Clifford Block, Education Technology Officer, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance, AID

00025

David R. Evans, Director, Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts

Stanley Handleman, Education Advisor, Bureau for Asia AID

Carlos Heymans, MOE, El Salvador

Robert Jacobs, Southern Illinois University

Henry Ingle, Academy for Educational Development

Thomas LaBelle, Assistant Dean for Research, Graduate School of Education and Coordinator for Research on Latin America, Latin American Center, UCLA.

Robert Smail, Regional Education Advisor, Agency for International Development

Lyra Srinavasan, World Education

Winarno Surakhmad, Deputy Director, Regional Center for Educational Innovation ad Technology (INNOTECH), Saigon

Kowit Vorapipatana, MOE, Thailand

Friday, April 26
9:00-11:30 a.m.

Concurrent Sessons

Sesson 1: Strategies for Developing NFE, Vista Room

George H. Axinn, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, and Executive Director, Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), Chairman

Olu Awe, Forest Ecologist, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Western State, Nigeria

Roger Cuyno, Instructor, College of Agriculture, University of the Philippines, Los Banos

Betru Gebregziabher, Assistant Head, Extension and Training Department, Chilalo Agricultural Development Unit (CADU), Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia

00026

Session 2: Making Learning Effective in NFE, Room 106

Ted Ward, Institute for International Studies in Education, Michigan State University, Chairman

Patrico Barriga, Formerly Field Director, Non-formal Educaton Project, Ecuador

Rolland Paulston, International and Development Education Program, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh

S. Michel Rousseau, Office of the North Region, Federacao de Orgaos Para Assistencia Social e Educacional (FASE), Brazil

Session 3: New Directions in NFE, Heritage Room

Stanley Applegate, Education, Science and Technology Division Chief, Office of Development Resources, Bureau of Latin America, Agency for International Development, Chairman

Thomas Fanning, Director, Information Materials Press

John McLain, Director, Research Learning Center, Clarion State College

Jack Vaughan, Director, International Children's Television Workshop

Session 4: Current Studies in NFE, Room 110

Marvin Grandstaff, Institute for International Studies in Education, Michigan State University, Chairman

Manzoor Ahmed, Associate Director, Educational Strategy Studies, International Council for Educational Development

Russell Kleis, Department of Administration and Higher Education, Michigan State University

Mauricio D. Leonor, Area Specialist in Agricultural Education, Southeast Asia Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO)

James Sheffield, Director, Center for Education in Africa, Teachers College, Columbia University

Wilson Velandia, Universidad Javerin, Colombia

12:15 **Luncheon and Conference Summary, Centennial Room**

Cole S. Brembeck, Chairman

Emily Vargas Adams, The Ford Foundation, Colombia

Sudi Bulbul, Deputy Under-Secretary, Ministry of Education, Turkey

Edwin Martin, Educational Advisor, African Bureau, Office of Technical Assistance, Agency of International Development

Bernard Wilder, Non-formal Education Officer, Office of Education and Human Resources, Technical Assistance Bureau, Agency for International Development

Adjournment

Appendix B-1

The Conference Participants

Countries and AID Missions

AFGHANISTAN: Anthony R. Lanza, Chief Education Officer, USAID; **M. M. Sediq**, Acting President, Provincial Development and Department

BANGLADESH: Kabir Chowdhury, Secretary, Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports; **David J. Garms**, Project Manager for Education and Training, USAID; **Faqrul Quadir**, Chief of Training, Integrated Rural Development Program.

BOLIVIA: Reynaldo Cardozo Arellano, Executive Director, Servicio Nacional de Formacion, de Mano de Obra, Ministry of Labor

BRAZIL: Luiz Savio de Almeida, Advisor to President of National Institute of Nutrition; **Maria Violeta Coutinhuo Villas Boas**, National Director of Professional Training, SENAC; **Edivaldo**

0002 8

Boaventura, Professor of Non-formal Education at Federal University of Bahia; **Sergo Marinho Barbosa**, MOBRAL; **Joao Jesus de Salles Pupo**, CENAFOR, Ministry of Education and Culture; **Joaquim Alfredo Soares Vianna**, Director, Department of Suppletive Education, Ministry of Education and Culture

CCLOMBIA: **Hernando Bernal Alarcon**, Planning Chief, Accion Cultural Popular (ACPO); **Peter L. Boynton**, Education Advisor, USAID; **Wilson Velandia**, Universidad Javerin

ECUADOR: **Patrico Barriga**, Formerly Field Director, Non-formal Education Project; **James Frits**, Behavioral Science Advisor, USAID; **Jon Gant**, Chief, ERD, SAID

EL SALVADOR: **Carlos Heymans**, Director, Instructional Television, Ministry of Education; **Ray San Giovanni**, Education Officer, USAID

ETHIOPIA: **Haile Yesus Abeje**, Assistant Minister of Elementary and Non-formal Education, Ministry of Education; **Ted Morse**, Chief Education Advisor, USAID; **Neway Wolde-Sadik**, Director General, Adult Education Department, Ministry of Education

GUATEMALA: **Mario Dardon**, Director, Programa de Educacion Basica Rural Ministerio de Educacion; **Howard Ray**, Basic Village Education Project, USAID

HONDURAS: **Alberto Alfonso Medina**, National Education Reform Commission, Ministry of Education; **Henry Reynolds**, Education Advisor, USAID

INDONESIA: **Anwas Iskandar**, Staff Member, Section on Non-formal Education, Office of Educational Development, Ministry of Education; **Soenarjono**, Director of Rural Mass Education, Sports and Youth, Ministry of Education; **Soemitro Sumantri Wignjowiyono**, chairman, Institute of Educational Experimentation, Office of Educational Development, Ministry of Education; **Wirosuhardjo Kartomo**, Educational and Cultural Attache, Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, Washington

JAMAICA: **Andrew Dunbar**, Division of Educational Planning, Ministry of Education

KENYA: **Frederick Okatcha**, Head, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi; **David Macharia**, Director, Institute of Adult Studies, University of Nairobi

NEPAL: **Krishna Prasad Pant**, Under Secretary, Adult Education Division, Ministry of Education

NICARAGUA: **Peter Tobia**, Chief, Human Resources Division, USAID

00029

NIGERIA: **James H. Kirk**, Education Officer, USAID; **Z. A. Oshadiya**, Senior Inspector of Education, Ministry of Education, Lagos State

PANAMA: **Henry H. Bassford**, Capital Projects Development Officer, USAID

PARAGUAY: **Tito Rojas Cardozo**, Coordinator, Social Sector, Technical Planning Secretariat, Member, Council of the National Service for Profession Improvement; **Frank A. Mann**, Chief, Education Division, USAID; **Maria Francisca Valiente Marengo**, Programming Technician, Educational TV Department, Ministry of Education

PERU: **Luciano Chang**, Project Director of Non-formal Programs, Ministry of Education; **Lucio Flores**, Director of Basic Education, Ministry of Education; **Edgar Valdivia**, Director of Speical Programs, Ministry of Education

SOUTH VIETNAM: **Tran Canh Xuan**, Ministry of Education

THAILAND: **Kowit Vorapipatana**, Chief, Adult Education Division, General Education Department, Ministry of Education

TURKEY: **Sudi Bulbul**, Deputy Under-Secretary, Ministry of Education

National and International Organizations

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: **Selma M. Dublin**, Program Director, Information Center on Instructional Technology; **Henry T. Ingle**, Program Officer, Instructional Technology Projects; **Stephen F. Moseley**, Director of Administration; **Thomas Rich**, Florida Mental Health Institute, Tampa

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: **Stanley Applegate**, Education Science and Technology Division Chief, Office of Development Resources, Bureau for Latin American; **Joel Bernstein**, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Technical Assistance; **Clifford Block**, Education Technology Officer, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance; **James Chandler**, Director, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance; **Harold Freeman**, Chief Education Officer, Bureau for Asia, Office of Technical Support; **Eleanor Green**, Chief Education Officer, Bureau for Supporting Assistance; **Stanley**

00030

Handleman, Education Advisor, Bureau for Asia, Office of Technical Support; **Edwin Martin**, Educational Advisor, African Bureau, Office of Technical Assistance; **James T. O'Meara**, International Training Division; **R. G. Ravenholt**, Director, Office of Population; **James Singletary**, Chief, Human Resources Office, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance; **Myron H. Vent**, Education Officer Special Projects, Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance; **John Welty**, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination; **Marjorie Wheatley**, Bureau for Supporting Assistance, Office of Regional Development; **Bernard Wilder**, Non-formal Education Officer, Office of Education and Human Resources, Technical Assistance Bureau; **Robert H. Wilson**, Office of Labor Affairs; **Leonard Pompa**, Asia Tech PSD

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION: **David G. Imig**, Program Director

BRITISH COUNCIL: **James R. Potts**, Educational Broadcasting Officer III, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

FEDERACAO de ORGAOS PARA ASSISTENCIA SOCIAL e EDUCACIONAL (FASE), Brazil: **S. Michel Rousseau**, The Office of the North Region of FASE

FORD FOUNDATION: **Emily Vargas Adams**, Columbia; **Aftab Akhtar**, Program Officer, Pakistan

FRANKLIN BOOKS PROGRAM, INC.: **Iraj Jahanshahi**, Ministry of Education, Iran; **John H. Kyle**, President; **Ali Osghar Mohajer**, Managing Director, Iran

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK: **Aluzio Pimenta**, Education Section

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION: **Ann Hartfiel, Jan Van Orman**

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT: **Duncan Ballantine**, Director, Education Department; **Clifford Gilpin**, Education Department

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S TELEVISION WORKSHOP: **Jack Vaughan**, Director

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: **Manzoor Ahmed**, Associate Director, Educational Strategy Studies

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING: **W. K. Medlin**

W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION: **William Wilkie**, Program Director

MIDWEST UNIVERSITIES CONSORTIUM FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES: George Axinn, Executive Director

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES: Antonio Fereira de Andrade, Planning and Research Coordinator, UTRANIG, Belo Horizonte, Mina Gerais, Brazil; **:Luis Oyarzun Leiva**, Asuncion, Paraguay; **Gonzalo Gonzalez Llanes**, Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico; **Evenor Zuniga**, Department of Educational Affairs, OAS/Washington

REGIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY (INNOTECH): Winarno Surakhmad, Deputy Director

SERVICO NACIONAL de APRENDIZAGEM INDUSTRIAL (SENAI): Joao Baptista Salles da Silva, Coordinator of Education, **Paulo Ernesto Tolle**, Regional Director

SOUTHEAST ASIA MINISTERS OF EDUCATION ORGANIZATON (SEAMEO): Mauricio D. Leonor, Area Specialist in Agricultural Education; **Robert Smail**, R.E.D./AID

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION: Robert Leestma, Director, Institute of International Studies

WORLD EDUCATION: Jack Mezirow, Department of Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University; **Lyra Srinavasan**, Director, Methods and Materials Center; **Dolores D. Wharton**, Board Member

YMCA: Robert Brantley, International Division

Universities

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BUFFALO: Nat Colletta, Faculty of Educational Studies

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, San Diego; James Hoxeng, Institute for Cultural Pluralism, School of Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Berkeley: Guy Benveniste, Director, Program in International Education Finance, School of Education; **Irene Blumenthal**, Associate Research Political Scientist, Program in International Education Finance

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles: Thomas La Belle, Assistant Dean of Research, Graduate School of Education, and Coordinator for Research on Latin America, Latin America Center

CLARION STATE COLLEGE: John McLain, Director, Research Learning Center

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY: **James Sheffield**, Center for Education in Africa, Teachers College

DREXEL UNIVERSITY: **Richard E. Speagle**, College of Business and Administration

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY: **George Aker**, Director, Division of Educational Management Systems, College of Education; **Robert Morgan**, Director, Center for Educational Technology

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY: **Bradley Billings**, Director of Public Services Laboratory

HARVARD UNIVERISTY: **Jose M. G. Almeida, Jr.**, **Nicholas W. Danforth**, **John Hilliard**, **Dave Kline**, **Herbert Muchemeva Murerwa**, **Manuel Zymelman**, **and Alex Lorca**, Center for Studies in Education and Development

HOWARD UNIVERSITY: **Cecile H. Edwards**, Head, Home Econics Department

INDIANA UNIVERSITY: **Michael Chiappetta**, Chairman, Department of International and Comparative Education, School of Education

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE: **Scott Adams**, **Edward Berman**, Center for International Education

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS: **David R. Evans**, Director, Center for International Education, School of Education

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: **Richard Adams**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Olu Awe**, Research Associate, Institue for International Studies in Education; **George H. Axinn**, Department of Agricultural Economics; **Franklin Bobbitt**, Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum; **Michael Borus**, School of Labor and Industrial Relations; **Cole S. Brembeck**, Associate Dean, College of Education and Director, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Lu Bruch**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Melvin Buschman**, Assistant Director, Continuing Education; **Roger Cuyno**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Susan de Leon**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Louis Doyle**, Continuing Education; **Betru Gebregziabher**, Continuing Education; **Keith Goldhammer**, Dean, College of Education; **Marvin Grandstaff**, Institute for International Studies in Education and Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum; **John Hanson**, Institute for International Studies in Education, African Studies Center, and Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum; **David K. Heenan**, Associate Director, Institute for International Studies in Education; **William Herzog**, Department of Communications; **Homer Higbee**,

00033

Assistant Dean, International Studies and Programs; **Mary Kay Hobbs**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **John Hunter**, Department of Economics and Director, Latin American Studies Center; **John Ivey**, Department of Administration and Higher Education; **Thomas Kelly**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Russell Kleis**, Department of Administration and Higher Education; **Kirkpatrick Lawton**, Assistant Dean, International Studies and Programs; **Michael Lukomski**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **David Morton**, Research Associate, Department of Administraton and Higher Education; **Kenneth Neff**, Institute for International Studies and Programs; **Richard O. Niehoff**, Center for International Studies and Programs; **Lynn Schlueter**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education; **Ralph Smuckler**, Dean, International Studies and Programs; **Frederick Waisanen**, Department of Sociology; **Ted Ward**, Institute for International Studies in Education and Department of Secondary Education ad Curriculum; **Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.**, President; **Daphne Williams**, Research Associate, Institute for International Studies in Education

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION: **Allen Thomas**, Chairman, Department of Adult Education

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH: **Roland G. Paulston**, International and Development Education Program, School of Education

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY: **Frederick Harbison**, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY: **Robert Jacobs**

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX: **John Oxenham**, Institute of Development Studies

TUSKEGEE UNIVERISTY: **Peggy Sparks**, Director, Human Resources Development Center

00034

Workshop Teams and Participants

Group I: Manpower Training

Joaquim Vianna, Director,
Department of Supletive Education
Ministry of Education and Culture, Brazil

Joao B. Salles da Silva
Coordinator of Education and Training
SENAI - Sao Paulo, Brazil

Violeta Villa Boas, Head of the Division of Vocational Education for Commerce and Service
National Department of National Service for Commercial Apprenticeship

Sudi Bulbul, Deputy Under-Secretary
Ministry of Education, Ankara, Turkey

Gonzalo Gonalez Llanes
Consejo Nacional Tecnico de la Educacion
Luus Gonzalez Oleregon 21, Mexico 1, Dof., Mexico

Tito Ropas, Member Council of the National Service for Professions Improvement, Paraguay

Maria F. Valiente Marengo, Member of Program Design Center for Teleducation, Ministry of Education, Paraguay

Antonio Ferreire de Andrade, University of Labor of Minas Gerais
Belo Horizonte, Brazil

Group II: Group Composition

Kabir Chowdhury, Secretary
Ministry of Education, Cultural Affairs and Sports, Bangladesh

Lire Srinivisan, Director
Methods and Materials Center
World Education, New York

M. D. Leonor, Jr.
Area Specialist in Agricultural Education
SEAMEO

Mir Mohm. Sediq, Acting President
Provincial Development and Department, Afghanistan

Edgar Valdivia
Director of Special Programs
Ministry of Education, PERU

Luciano Chang
Project Director of Non-formal Programs
Ministry of Education, PERU

Alberto Alfonso Medina
National Education Reform Commission
Ministry of Education
HONDURAS

Anwas Iskandar, Staff Member
Section on Non-formal Education
Office of Educational Development
Ministry of Education

Faqrul Quadir
Chief of Training
Integrated Rural Development Program

Lucio Flores
Director of Basic Education
Ministry of Education

Edivaldo Boaventura
Professor Non-formal Education at Federal University of Bahia

Luiz Savio de Almeida
Advisor to President of National Institute of Nutrition

Hernando Bernal Alarcon
Planning Chief
Accion Cultural Popular (ACPO)

Group III: Report "Coordination and Communication"

Wilson B. Velandia
Professor
School of Education
Javeriana University
Bogota, Colombia

Neway Wolde-Sadik
Director General
Adult Educationand Literacy Division
Ministry of Education and Fine Arts
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Krishna P. Pant
Under Secretary, Adult Education Division
Ministry of Education
Government of Nepal
Kathmandu, Nepal

Z. S. Osadiya
Ministry of Education
216 Yakubu Gowon Street
Lagos, Nigeria

Paulo Ernesto Tolle
Regional Director
Servico Nacional de Aprendizagem Industrial (SENAI)

000036

Sergio M. Barbosa
MOBRAL, Brazil

Iraj Jahanshahi
Ministry of Education, Iran
Franklin Books Program, Inc.

David Macharia, Director
Institute of Adult Studies
University of Nairobi

Emily V. Adams
Ford Foundation
Colombia

Soemitro S. Wignjowiyono, Chairman
Institute of Educational Experimentation
Office of Educational Development
Ministry of Education
Indonesia

Rogelio V. Cuyno
Research Associate
Institute for International Studies in Education
MSU

Robert L. Brantley
International Division, YMCA

00037

The Program of Studies in Non-formal Education at Michigan State University

The Program of Studies in Non-formal Education, made possible by funding from the Agency for International Development, has two primary objectives: 1) to help build a systematic knowledge base about non-formal education, and 2) to assist in the application of knowledge in the developing areas of the world through consultation, technical assistance, conferences, workshops, evaluation, training programs, and the dissemination of information about non-formal education.

The program is based on the assumption that knowledge-building and action go hand-in-hand. Through studies of non-formal education in practice we seek to gain important knowledge and insights about it. In turn, we, the MSU faculty and research associates in this program, use this knowledge to improve our response capability in working with others who are planning, administering, and operating non-formal education programs in different parts of the world. The end that we seek is to join with others in strengthening non-formal educational resources as a significant part of nationwide learning systems.

At Michigan State University studies in non-formal education have been conducted by nine teams of faculty members and research associates on numerous aspects of the subject over the last three years. The studies range widely over non-formal education, dealing with such matters as its history, categories and strategies, economic value, and modes of learning. Other studies compare country programs, survey case studies, examine the feasibility of designing non-formal education models, look at administrative alternatives, and lay out plans for training programs in non-formal education.

The study teams are cross-disciplinary in composition, representing such areas as economics, labor and industrial relations; political science; public administration; agricultural economics; sociology, and education. Together, members of the teams have produced nearly 100 working papers, many of which were shared and debated in three series of semi-weekly seminars for all program participants. The working papers, copies of which are available upon request through the Information Center, provide the basic ideas for the published reports. These include a series of discussion papers and final team reports. Some team

00038

reports are available at the Information Center. A final program volume is also available. All published materials in the program are under the general editorship of Marvin Grandstaff who has been assisted by Lu Bruch.

The following is a list of non-formal education problems addressed in the studies, and the persons studying them:

Historical Perspectives: the relationship of formal and non-formal education over time, with emphasis on trends and problems at various stages of development. Study team leader: Marvin Grandstaff, Institute for International Studies in Education and the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum; Research Associates: Lynn Schlueter, John Thompson, Malcolm Lawson, and Frank Guldbrandsen.

Categories and Strategies: categories by geographic area, delivery system, target group, and objective and substantive content. Strategies for program development within specific categories. Study team leader: George H. Axinn, Executive Director, MUCIA, and Professor, Agricultural Economics; Research Associates: Olu Awe, Roger Cuyno, William Kieffer, Jose Mesa, John Shields, Carol Thompson, and David Wadsworth.

Country Comparisons: the scope of non-formal education, its cost, relative importance, problems, and limitations. Study team leaders: Richard O. Niehoff, Center for International Studies and Programs, and Bernard Wilder, Institute for International Studies in Education; Research Associate: Nat Colletta.

Learning Effectiveness: the learning components and variables which are most critical in non-formal education situations and processes. Study team leaders: Ted Ward, Institute for International Studies in Education and the Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum, and William Herzog, Department of Communications; Research Associates: Lois McKinney, John Dettoni, and Norman Anderson.

Economic Factors: a systematic review of what is known about the relative cost advantage of alternative modes of education. Study team leaders: John Hunter, professor of economics and director, Latin American Studies Center, and Michael Borus, School for Labor and Industrial Relations; Research Associates: Fernand Goudreault, Michael Lukomski, and Abdul Mannan.

Case Study Survey: replicability in other settings, cost-benefit comparisons, problems of measurement, and variables important to success. Study team members: Russell J. Kleis, Department of Administration ad Higher Education, Melvin Buschman, Continuing Education Service, and Louis A. Doyle, Continuing Education Service.

ERIC

Model Feasibility: models of the human resource sector with full attention to the role of non-formal education within the total system. Study team leader: Frederick Waisanen, Department of Sociology.

Administrative Alternatives: for creating and managing non-formal education programs. Study team leaders: Richard O. Niehoff, Ralph Smuckler, Center for International Studies in Programs, and Bernard Wilder, Institute for International Studies in Education.

Participant Training: alternative designs for providing training in non-formal education. Study team leaders: Kenneth L. Neff, Institute for International Studies in Education, and Homer Higbee, Center for International Studies and Programs.

Where are we now? What of the future?

In the pursuit of these studies we have always tried to keep one question steadily before us: What assistance does this knowledge provide to those whose primary concern is with action - the planning and implementing of non-formal education in practice? Indeed, many of the studies have drawn heavily on our experience in working and consulting with colleagues in a number of countries who are planning and operating non-formal education programs in such countries as Brazil, Peru, Paraguay, Ecuador, Jamaica, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, and Thailand. (And we hope that his conference and workshop will further expand the network of relationships among all those who work on the exciting frontier of non-formal education).

Now that our major studies are nearing completion we are devoting more time and energy to field support activites in the developing areas of the world. These activities relate to a number of important aspects of non-formal education and include assistance in:

Planning	Workshops and seminars
Evaluation	Dissemination of Information
Training	Project Development

Further information about the program of studies and the field support activities may be obtained from Cole S. Brembeck, director, and David K. Heenan, associate director, Institute for International Studies in Education, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 48824. Inquiries may also be directed to the Office of Education and Human Resources, Bureau for Technical Assistance, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

000-40